

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/061,418	Applicant(s) LAUGHLIN, JOHN D.	
	Examiner Minh H Chau	Art Unit 2854	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Steven R. Ormiston. (3) ____.
- (2) Minh H Chau. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 02 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

- Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In the telephone communications, Mr. Ormiston has been informed that the Amendment filed on 12/02/2003 have some typo errors (claims 12 and 15) that needs to be corrected. Mr. Ormiston had indicated that there is no typo errors according to his Amendment version filed on 12/02/03. Therefore, the typo error may have been happened when the Patent Office scanning the document. An Examiner's Amendment has been suggested by the Examiner to correct these typo errors and Mr. Ormiston has agreed to the suggestion .